



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/818,134	03/27/2001	Sabin Belu	RN 58 (2635-019-03)	8657
72455 7590 11/25/2008 Graybeal Jackson Haley c/o RealNetworks Graybeal Jackson Haley LLP 155 - 108th Ave NE Suite 350 Bellevue, WA 98004-5973			EXAMINER CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T	
			ART UNIT 2166	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/818,134	Applicant(s) BELU, SABIN	
	Examiner SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA	Art Unit 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-34 are pending in this application.
2. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 8/25/2008.
3. Examiner acknowledges applicant's "supplemental declaration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.131 filed on 8/25/2008.

Drawings

4. The Drawings filed on 3/27/2001 are acceptable for examination purpose

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, it is unclear what is meant by "single action is a "double click"

7. As to Claim 24, applicant appear to be invoking 112, sixth paragraph "means for" type language, but it is unclear what "structures" are being used to perform the functions. No particular structures are identified in the specification that would perform the function. The claim merely directed to " A system for creatingthe system comprising: steps . One of skill in the art would not be apprised of what structures are intended to be encompassed by the claims. Nor would it be clear what the structures are intended to accomplish.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106(II)A:

Identify and understand Any Practical Application Asserted for the Invention The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of “real world” value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96); In re Ziegler, 992, F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). Accordingly, a complete disclosure should contain some indication of the practical application for the claimed invention, i.e., why the applicant believes the claimed invention is useful.

Apart from the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101, usefulness under the patent eligibility standard requires significant functionality to be present to satisfy the useful

Art Unit: 2166

*result aspect of the practical application requirement. See Arrhythmia, 958 F.2d at 1057, 22 USPQ2d at 1036. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material **stored in a computer-readable medium does not make the invention eligible for patenting.***

*For example, a claim directed to a word processing **file stored on a disk may satisfy the utility** requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 since the information stored may have some **“real world”** value. However, the mere fact that the claim may satisfy the utility requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 **does not mean that a useful result is achieved under the practical application requirement. The claimed invention as a whole must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible” result to have a practical application***

9. As to Claims 22-24, in the preamble, the applicant states that it is a “system” claim. In a “system” claim there must be a hardware component such as a processor or memory that the software modules are stored in or run on.

See MPEP 2106.01 [R-5].

Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.

10. The claims 22-25,29 lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical

Art Unit: 2166

compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material per se.

On page 9, lines 24-28 of the specification applicant has provided evidence that applicant intends computer readable medium in claim 25 to include transmission type media, such as signal, as such the claim is drawn to a form of energy. Energy is not one of the four categories of invention and therefore the claim(s) is/are not statutory. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and thus is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not combination of substances and therefor not a composition of matter.

For “General Analysis for Determining Patent-Eligible Subject Matter”, see 101 Interim Guidelines as indicated below:

<<<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>>>

see MPEP 8th edition, Rev 7, July 2008

No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

12. ***Claims 1-10, 20, 24, 26, 27, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Halpern et al. [hereafter Halpen], US Patent No. 6282711 filed on Aug 10, 1999.***

13. As to Claim 1, Halpern teaches a system which including ‘ a method for creating, in response to only a single action by a user enabled electronic device a self-extracting file [col 1, line 36-37, col 4, line 57-61, line 66-67, col 5, line 6-7, col 6, line 19-22, line 47-52, fig 1], Halpen teaches user interface allows users to select required program in a “single action” for example “double click [col 1, line 36-37] is common knowledge in the art, further Halpen also specifically teaches “self-extracting” executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

receiving from the user enabled electronic device,[col 5, line 41-44, fig 1] an input file to be used in creating a self-extracting file [col 6, line 47-52], self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen’s self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

without further action by the user enabled electronic device, [col 3, line 42-49],

Halpen specifically teaches dynamically producing required software installation files particularly via user interface template as detailed in fig 1, col 3, line 42-49]; ‘ creating a self-extracting file using the input file, wherein the input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file’ [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches “auto-launch” or “auto-start” feature for installation the selected program applications and files.

14. As to Claim 2, Halpern disclosed wherein the received input file has an associated filename and wherein a filename for the self-extracting file is automatically generated based in part on the associated filename of the received input file [Abstract, line 21-25, col 1, line 41-44,col 3, line 62-67, col 12, line 46-50].

15. The limitations of claims 10, 20, 26 and 32 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 1 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

16. As to Claim 3, Halpern teaches a system which including ‘a method for creating, in response to a single action [col 3, line 1-4], single action corresponds to in response to the user’s input; ‘ a self-extracting file from an associated input file, wherein the associated input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches “auto-launch” or “auto-start” feature for installation the selected program applications and files, self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen’s self-

Art Unit: 2166

extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

‘ and wherein a user is not required to separately choose a data compression method [col 7, line 39-45], Halpern specifically teaches “compression process” of files to create a compressed installation as detailed in col 7, line 39-45]; ‘ create a compressed archive using the chosen compression method’ [col 1, line 33-39], Halpern specifically teaches both compression and decompression of files particularly with respect to self-extracting of files using PKUNZIP process, further as best understood by the examiner, “PKUNZIP” corresponds to compression/archive program and therefore “compressed archive using the compression method” is integral part of Halpern’s teaching, also it is noted that PKUNZIP is a “software” tool for compression/archiving files; ‘select an input file to be launched upon decompression of the compressed archive, and create a self-extracting file from the compressed archive, the method comprising [col 1, line 33-39, col 4, line 9-12, col 7, line 39-41]

receiving an input file to be used in creating a self-extracting file [col 3, line 1-4, line 62-67], Halpern specifically teaches user interface, where user selecting or inputting required installation of package containing files and/programs, particularly self-extracting files, ‘wherein the file is one of a plurality of file types’ [col 1, line 41-44, col 2, line 28-30], plurality of files corresponds to setup.exe or install.exe files are part of Windows NT or Unix file system

in response to only a single action[col 1, line 36-37] “single action” for example “double click is common knowledge in the art, creating a self-extracting file from the input file, wherein the input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-

Art Unit: 2166

extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpen specifically teaches “auto-launch” or “auto-start” feature for installation the selected program applications and files; self-extracting file corresponds to Halpen’s self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52.

17. As to Claim 4, Halpern disclosed ‘ wherein the single action is a single click’ [col 1, line 33-37, col 4, line 66-67, col 5, line 1-7], Halpern specifically teaches user interface that allows users to select required options

18. As to Claim 5, Halpern disclosed ‘wherein the single action is a double click.
[col 1, line 33-37]

19. As to Claims 6-7, Halpern disclosed single action is speaking a sound, pressing a key ‘[col 3, line 1-7, col 4, line 66-67, fig 1].

20. As to Claim 8, Halpern disclosed ‘wherein the single action is a call from a software routine’ [col 3, line 37-38].

21. As to Claim 9, Halpern disclosed ‘further comprising generating a filename for the self-extracting file , wherein the generated filename is based on a filename associated with the input file [col 1, line 25-44, col 2, line 28-29, fig 1].

Art Unit: 2166

22. The limitations of claim 24 are rejected in the analysis of claim 3 above, and the claim 24 is rejected on that basis.

23. As the Claim 27, the limitations of claim 27 are similar to the limitations of claim 1 above. Halpern further teaches the executable file includes a compressed copy of the input file, and wherein the compressed copy of the input file is automatically decompressed [col 1, line 33-44, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-2, line 9-12]. Therefore, the limitations of claim 27 are rejected in the analysis of Claim 1 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

24. The limitations of claim 31 are rejected in the analysis of claim 27above, and the claim 31 is rejected on that basis.

25. As to Claim 33, Halpen disclosed 'wherein the input file is an executable routine and wherein a function of the executable routine is called upon loading of the executable routine [col 1, line 41-44]

26. ***Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wygodny et al. [hereafter Wygodny], US Patent No. 6202199 based on provisional application No. 60/055,165 filed on July 31,1997.***

27. As to Claim 21, Wygodny teaches a system which including ' a method of creating a self-extracting file' [col 16, line 41-44], self-extracting file corresponds to Wygodny's self-extracting file;

displaying a first frame used to allow a user to specify an input file to be converted to a self-extracting file [col 8, line 51-55, col 17, line 1-7, fig 3A, fig 9-10], displaying a first frame corresponds to Wygodny's fig 3A, frame window 300 split frame having four panes is part of the user interface, further Wygodny also teaches user selecting specific file from the file menu or dialog box as detailed in col 17, line 1-7;

receiving the input file specified by the user, wherein the received input file is automatically configured as a self-extracting file, and wherein the input file is automatically launched upon execution of the self-extracting file [col 17, line 1-12, line 21-23, line 33-41, line 43-47, fig 10-11]; Wygodny specifically teaches user interface allows to select required file from the file list as detailed in fig 10-11

displaying a second frame, [fig 3A-3B, fig 5] wherein the second frame includes a link related to the self-extracting file created from the user specified input file [col 17, line 1-7, line 49-56], displaying a second frame corresponds to Wygodny's fig 3A

Art Unit: 2166

28. As to Claim 22, Wygodny teaches a system which including 'system for creating a self-extracting file [col 16, line 41-44], self-extracting file corresponds to Wygodny's self-extracting file;

a receiving module configured to receive an input file, wherein the input file received is one of a plurality of file types and wherein the input file includes an associated filename [col 9, line 9-13, line 57-62, col 12, line 24-35], input files and file names corresponds to executable files shown in the display window as detailed in fig 3A, element 314;

a naming module configured to create and name an output file, wherein the output filename is generated from the associated filename of the input file [col 7, line 12-15], Wygodny specifically teaches file input/output operations; 'and wherein the naming module receives the input file from the receiving module' [col 10, line 63-67]

a self-extracting module configured to transform the output file into a executable file, wherein the self-extracting module receives the input file and the output file from the naming module;

a loader module configured to setup the executable file to launch the input file upon execution of the executable file, wherein the loader module receives the executable file and the input file from the self-extracting module [col 9, line 9-13, line 57-62, col 12, line 24-35, line 44-46, col 17, line 43-53, fig 10];

a compressing module configured to compress the input file and attach the compressed input file to the executable file, wherein the compressing module receives

Art Unit: 2166

the input file and the executable file from the loader module [col 16, line 39-44, col 17, line 43-53, fig 10]

29. As to Claim 23, Wygodny specifically teaches 'wherein the loader module is further configured to setup the executable file to perform unload processes' [col 5, line 65-67, col 6, line 1-10].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. ***Claims 11-19,25,28-29, 30, 34, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Halpern et al. [hereafter Halpen], US Patent No. 6282711 filed on Aug 10,1999 as applied to claim 10, 32, above, and further in view of Gage et al. [hereafter Gage], US Patent No. 5923846 published on July 13, 1999.***

32. As to Claim 11, Halpern disclosed wherein the creation of the self-extracting file opening an output file [col 6, line 47-52], self-extracting file corresponds to Halpern's self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

attaching a decompression engine to the output file, wherein the decompression engine is capable of decompressing compressed data [col 4, line 9-12]

attaching a loader to the output file, wherein the loader configures the output file so as to automatically launch, after execution of the self-extracting file [Abstract, line 23-25, col 3, line 62-67, col 4, line 1-5, col 6, line 47-52], Halpern specifically teaches “auto-launch” or “auto-start” feature for installation the selected program applications and files, self-extracting file corresponds to Halpern’s self-extracting executable programs and data files as detailed in col 6, line 47-52;

‘compressing the received input file according to a data compression method; attaching an archive including information about the compressed input file [col 1, line 33-39], Halpern specifically teaches both compression and decompression of files particularly with respect to self-extracting of files using PKUNZIP process, further as best understood by the examiner, “PKUNZIP” corresponds to compression/archive program and therefore “compressed archive using the compression method” is integral part of Halpern’s teaching, also it is noted that PKUNZIP is a “software” tool for compression/archiving files

closing the output file, wherein the closed output file is the self-extracting file [col 6, line 19-22, line 54-60].

It is however, noted that Halpern does not specifically teach “temporary files”, “archive header” On the other hand, Gage disclosed “temporary files” [col 11, line 61-67, col 12, line 1-4, fig 3-4], Gage specifically teaches source files are copied, and compressed into the temporary files as detailed in col 11, line 62-64; “archive header [fig 5, col 14, line 21-25, line 34-41], Gage specifically teaches header data structure information including compressed file format as detailed in col 14, line 34-41.

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of uploading/downloading files on a computer network of Gage et al. into user initiating the installation of software via distributed processing network of Halpern et al because both Halpern, Gage specifically teaches compression and decompression process particularly, using PKZIP [Halpern: col 1, line 33-39; Gage: col 10, line 45-50, col 12, line 1-4], both Halpern, Gage specifically directed to "distributed processing network" [Halpern: fig 1; Gage: fig 1]. Therefore, based on Halpern, in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system of Halpern in order to provide temporary files during automatic file compression thereby increase the speed of uploading files in the distributed processing network, thus improving the quality and reliability of the system.

33. As to Claim 12, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the input file is received from a user enabled electronic device [fig 1].

34. As to Claim 13, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the input file is received from a software routine [col 2, line 66-67, col 3, line 1].

35. As to Claim 14-15, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the data compression method is the same method for all received input files [col 6, line 11-14].

Art Unit: 2166

36. As to Claim 16, Halpern disclosed 'wherein the loader attached to the output file depends on the file type of the input file [col 1, line 41-44, line 61-65].

37. As to Claim 17, Gage disclosed 'wherein the loader automatically unloads the temporary file' col 12, line 16-18].

38. As to Claim 18, Gage disclosed 'comprising attaching an unloader to the output file to automatically unload the temporary file' [col 9, line 61-65].

39. As to Claim 19, Gage disclosed 'wherein the unloader performs cleanup processes on the temporary file [col 14, line 57-60, col 15, line 5-8].

40. The limitations of claims 25 and 30 are rejected in the analysis of claims 10-11 above, and these claims are rejected on that basis. Therefore, based on Halpern in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system for archive header to include compressed file information in order to provide or display respective message to the user.

41. As to Claim 28, Halpern disclosed the packing and unpacking processes are done without any user intervention [see Abstract, col 6, line 1-10, line 17-22]. This teaches the packing and unpacking processes being done. Therefore, the limitations

Art Unit: 2166

of claim 28 are rejected in the analysis of claims 10-11 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis. Therefore, based on Halpern in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system for archive header to include compressed file information in order to provide or display respective message to the user.

42. The limitations of claim 29 are rejected in the analysis of claim 28 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

43. As to Claim 34, Gage disclosed ' wherein the input file is a dynamic link library file' [col 8, line 25-27]. Therefore, based on Halpern, in view of Gage, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Gage to the system of Halpern in order to provide temporary files during automatic file compression thereby increase the speed of uploading files in the distributed processing network, thus improving the quality and reliability of the system

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments [page 11-12],, and "supplemental declaration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.131 filed on 8/25/2008 with respect to claim1-34 have been considered but are moot in view of the above detailed rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- | | | |
|----|---------------|----------------|
| a. | US Patent No. | 6282711 |
| b. | US Patent No. | 5923846 |
| c. | US Patent No. | 6202199 |

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is 571-272-4108. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alam, Hosain, T, can be reached on (571) 272-3978. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free)

/Srirama Channavajjala/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2166.
November 22, 2008